

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-identified Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 5-8, 15, and 17-20. No new matter has been added.

Claims 6, 7, 15, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

While Applicants maintain that these claims are directed to statutory subject matter, inasmuch as they recite a storage medium, Applicants have amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 12-15, 17, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over allegedly admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,889,439 (Cook et al.), as evidenced by Canon Easy-WebPrint User Manual. Claims 3, 4, 11, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Cook et al., as evidenced by Canon Easy-WebPrint User Manual and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,282 (Miyamoto et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As recited in independent claims 5 and 6, Applicants' invention is directed to providing a zoom property attribute, which is used to scale a size of the content of a multi-page document. Further, the invention determines whether an amount of the content on the last page of the scaled document is less than a predetermined amount. If the amount is less than the predetermined amount, the invention further scales the size of the content down to fit the content to the nearest whole page.

With respect to independent claims 8 and 15, Applicants' invention is directed to determining whether an amount of content on a last page of printable pages is less than a predetermined amount. When the determined amount is less than the predetermined amount, the invention determines a user preference for either scaling a size of the content to fit the nearest

whole page or printing the plurality of pages. Where the preference is for scaling, the invention scales down a size of the content to fit to the nearest whole page, according to a zoom property attribute.

Accordingly, with the present amendments, Applicants have clarified the recited “scaling”, which is consistent with what would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, to remove any confusion. With respect to claim 5, for example, the amendments clarify that the size of *content* of a multi-page document is scaled down to fit the content to a nearest whole page. Cook et al. fails to suggest such a feature.

In particular, Cook et al. is directed to a system that causes a line of text that would otherwise be printed on a new page, to be printed on a previous page. This is achieved not by scaling the content of the document, but by changing the lower boundaries (i.e., margins) of the page. Thus, instead of scaling the size of content being printed in Cook et al., the footprint of the printed area on one page is increased by changing the margins.

In particular, Applicants note that Cook et al. is directed to automatic functions of an electronic typewriter. The scale of the typeface of a typewriter does not change with the changes suggested in Cook et al.. Thus, the scale of the content of the document would not change.

Miyamoto et al. is merely cited in the Office Action as describing the printing of a subset of pages according to user selection. Applicants submit that this document does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Cook et al..

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Cook et al. and Miyamoto et al., taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest, at least, the features of scaling a size of content of a multi-page document according to a zoom property attribute and further scaling the size of a content of the scaled multi-page document down to fit the content to a nearest whole page when the amount of the content on the last page is less than a predetermined amount, as generally recited in independent claims 5 and 6. In addition, Applicants also submit that those documents fail to disclose or suggest, at least, the features of, when an amount of content on a last page of

printable pages is less than a predetermined amount, determining a user preference for one of (i) scaling a size of the content to fit the nearest whole page, and (ii) printing the plurality of pages, and where the user preference is for scaling, scaling a size of the content down to fit the nearest whole page according to a zoom property attribute, as generally recited in independent claims 8 and 15.

The dependent claims are either directly or indirectly dependent from independent claims 5, 6, 8 and 15 , and are allowable by virtue of their dependency and in their own right for further defining the invention. Further independent consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections under § 103.

Applicants submit that all outstanding matters in this application have been addressed and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and passage to issue of the application are respectfully sought.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Justin J. Oliver
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,986

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
JJO:ytr

FCHS_WS 5172527v1